REMARKS

Examiner Interview

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the courtesy of the telephone interview on January 26, 2005 in which the Examiner corrected the grounds rejection cited in the November 2, 2004 Office Action. In particular, the Examiner stated claims 17-18, 21-24, 27-30, 33-36 and 39-40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), not 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as stated in the Office Action.

Rejections

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)
Claims 17-18, 21-24, 27-30, 33-36 and 39-40

Claims 17-18, 21-24, 27-30, 33-36 and 39-40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious by Sponheim et. al., U.S. Patent No. 6,639,610, in view of Williams et. al., US Patent No. 5,945,988. Applicant respectfully submits that the combination does not teach each and every element of the invention as claimed in claims 17-18, 21-24, 27-30, 33-36 and 39-40.

Sponheim discloses assigning uniform resource locators (URLs) to graphical web objects, such as buttons. A user can select a particular URL to be assigned to a button. The URL assignment is stored locally in a cookie data structure created by a web server. The cookie is sent back to the web server each time the web browser requests a web page. The web server uses the cookie to assign the URL to the button. Although the cookie is stored locally with the web browse, the cookie is created and used by the web server.

Williams discloses determining and dynamically updating user preferences in an entertainment system. A system controller offers supplemental programming information by displaying the information in a separate window on a television. In addition, the system controller monitors the user's web page activity.

With regards to independent claims 17, 23, 29 and 35, the Examiner rebutted Applicant's argument presented in the response mailed August 20, 2004, that Sponheim does teach or suggest locally determining whether an entry corresponding to the particular resource displayed on a web page is contained in a local database. In particular, the Examiner asserted that because the cookie containing the URL information is stored

locally, it follows that Sponheim discloses locally determining whether the cookie contains the assigned URL information. Although the cookie is stored locally, Sponheim discloses sending the cookie with each web page request to the web server. The web server uses to cookie to determine whether the URL information is stored in the cookie. Thus, Sponheim discloses remotely determining, by a web server, whether an entry is contained in a local database. In contrast, Applicant claims locally determining whether an entry corresponding to the particular resource displayed on a web page is contained in a local database. Therefore, Sponheim cannot be properly interpreted as teaching or suggesting this element.

Furthermore, Williams discloses managing an entertainment system that includes monitoring the user's web page activity. However, Williams does not teach or suggest locally determining whether an entry corresponding to a particular resource displayed on a web page is contained in a local database. As neither Sponheim nor Williams teach or suggest the claimed element, the combination cannot render obvious Applicant's invention as claimed in claims 17, 23, 29 and 35 and claims 18, 21-24, 27, 28, 30, 33, 34, 36, 39 and 40 that depend on them. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination.

Claims 19-20, 25-26, 31-32 and 37-38

Claims 19-20, 25-26, 31-32 and 37-38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Sponheim and Williams in view of Harris et. al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,014,635). Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Sponheim, Williams and Harris does not support a *prima facie* case of obviousness because the combination does not teach or suggest each and every limitation of Applicant's invention as claimed in claims 19-20, 25-26, 31-32 and 37-38. Claims 19-20, 25-26, 31-32 and 37-38 depend from independent claims 17, 23, 29 and 35. Because Sponheim and Williams do not teach or suggest each and every limitation of claims 17, 23, 29 and 35, Harris must disclose at least the missing elements in order to have a *prima facie* case for the dependent claims.

However, Harris discloses a system for providing a discount credit-based transition network. Furthermore, there is no disclosure in Harris that teaches or suggests web pages. Thus, Harris does not teach or suggest locally determining whether an entry

corresponding to the particular resource displayed on a web page is contained in a local database. Therefore, the combination cannot be interpreted as disclosing the claimed element and the combination cannot render obvious Applicant's invention as claimed in claims 17, 23, 29 and 35 and the claims depending from them (19-20, 25-26, 31-32 and 37-38). Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination.

SUMMARY

Claims 17-40 are currently pending. In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application and allowance of the pending claims.

If the Examiner determines the prompt allowance of these claims could be facilitated by a telephone conference, the Examiner is invited to contact Eric Replogle at (408) 720-3455.

Deposit Account Authorization

Authorization is hereby given to charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any charges that may be due. Furthermore, if an extension is required, then Applicant hereby requests such extension.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR
& ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: __Feb 1__, 2005

Eric S. Replogle
Agent for Applicant
Registration No. 52,161

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(408) 720-3455